

“TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS—”
FOR LASTING PEACE

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
★ BT
★ 736.4
★ T6
★

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
"To Combine Our Efforts"
FOR
LASTING PEACE
★ ★ ★ ★ ★

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
A Symposium

BT

736.4

Tb

CONTENTS

Preface	7
Working Together for Peace	9
GEORGIA HARKNESS	
A Sense of Social Responsibility	27
CAMERON P. HALL	
The United Nations and the Quest for Peace	45
ERNEST W. LEFEVER	
The Churches and International Affairs	59
ELFAN REES	
We, the People of the Local Churches	71
MARGARET BENDER	
Bibliography	87
Who's Who	89

336782

P R E F A C E

The two organizations which have made it possible to combine efforts for peace most effectively are the World Council of Churches and the United Nations. Both organizations are reflected in the pages of this book. Both can be intimately related to the local church.

There is another group, in existence a long time, which should be mentioned when we talk of peace. That is the missionary group. There is no doubt that the combination of efforts on the mission field made the World Council a reality. Those close to the United Nations organization say that the missionary movement played a far greater part in its origin than many persons know.

The experimentation of missions in working together has been done because of necessity. The non-Christian forces have been too great for one mission to go it alone. The same necessity that drew mission groups together is forcing the entire community of men of good will to look for greater and greater areas of cooperation. We are referring to the non-Christian forces both in the Christian world and without it which would lead us into war.

It is appropriate that societies which gave rise to the mission movement should study, this year, to find wider avenues of cooperation. We present this book in the hope that the search will be as productive of genuine cooperative efforts as the mission movement has been.

CHAPTER I
WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE
By GEORGIA HARKNESS

This book is concerned with the necessity, the possibility, and the strategy of working together for peace. It deals, therefore, with the most important social issue which confronts our society today.

No extended argument is required to defend the view that peace is desperately needed in our world, and that we must combine our efforts if we are to have it. Peace is, perhaps, the one thing that everybody the world over desires. Whatever the status of a man's education, material possessions, religious faith, race, nation, or form of government, he knows that he would rather have his country at peace than at war. This is not to say that wars might not occur which would receive support; the opposite is obvious. Yet nobody wants war, and peace is the great desire of all mankind.

It cannot be said that there is any such agreement on the necessity of working together for peace. While wars are seldom, if ever, caused by the act of one person or one group, human nature has a common habit of blaming someone else for whatever happens, and the people of every nation tend to think that peace can come only when some other group stops inciting war. This partial truth often obscures the fact that the people of a genuinely peace-loving nation, *by working together*, can go far toward counteracting the causes of war which may arise elsewhere. In any event, peacemaking is too big a task to be achieved by anything but the dedicated,

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

patient, continuing effort of millions of peace-loving citizens.

Circles of Cooperation

If we are to work together for peace, the effort must proceed within several concentric circles. First, it is clear that Christians must learn to work with other Christians from common Christian principles. This is not to say that all Christians must agree, or in good conscience can agree, on every detail of political action. The issues are too complex, the decisions too personal, for this, and only a dictatorial church could compel unanimity of thought or action. Yet there are great common principles in our Christian faith—theological convictions and ethical obligations which are very widely agreed upon by thoughtful Christians—and to the degree that we act upon them we shall act with the greater assurance that we are working with God in the spirit of Christ.

Fortunately these common Christian principles have been stated a number of times and on different levels: by The Methodist Church in its General Conference action, by the National Council of Churches, and by the World Council of Churches. Even on the difficult problem of the individual Christian who is faced with participating in war—that of pacifism versus non-pacifism—the agreements among Christians are far greater than the differences.

A second concentric circle within which we must act is that of Christians working with other American citizens who are "men of good will," believing in the democratic way of life and its requirements of liberty and justice for all. Some of these are secularists who have inherited Christian ideals but have lost contact with the

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

church and personal Christian experience; some are Jews sharing with Christians a common Old Testament faith; some are followers of the various psychological cults; a few in this country are Buddhists, Mohammedans, and the like. Yet politically we meet as citizens of a great country in which every man is permitted in freedom to follow the faith of his choice, or to have no religious faith.

To be a good Christian and to be a good American are not synonymous; and to assume that "the American way of life" is the same thing as the Christian way of life is to lose sight of what is distinctive in the Christian gospel of faith and love. There is always a subtle danger that this identification will be made, and that we shall thereby lose our Christian perspective. Yet in many matters we have to act with citizens of another background and outlook. The Christian therefore has a double task: to act personally from Christian foundations and at the same time to work as far as possible in harmony with others, provided support can be given together to "the things that make for peace." This is the only way in which as a nation our country can exercise its great political power on the side of peace.

In working with those who do not share the Christian outlook there is always danger of compromise. One of the most difficult problems is to know when to concede for the sake of achieving some advance, and at what point to stand resolute. The Christian who works with those who are not Christians—or with his fellow-Christians of differing opinions—must always keep his ideals clearly before him, judge every concrete step as to whether it is an advance toward them or a retreat, and accept what is less than full Christian action only when

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

he is convinced that it is in the right direction and is the best possible under the circumstances.

A third concentric circle takes us outside of both the church in its world-wide scope and America in its position of world responsibility. This is the sphere of the world of nations, functioning, though not yet completely, through the United Nations, embracing people of many languages, cultures, and religious faiths, including in its scope comfortable and opulent peoples and those living in hunger and bitter poverty, big nations and little nations, the democracies and those many millions of people now living under Communist rule. It is here, of course, that the difficulties of working together for peace become most acute. Yet even here the situation is not hopeless. If we will cooperate as far as cooperation is possible, peaceful co-existence—or if one does not like that term, “living together in a divided world,” as the report from the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches called it—will be possible. And however far from ideal this situation may be, co-existence is better than no existence.

Later chapters of this book will deal with what is being done, what can be done, and what ought to be done in economic and civic relations, in the United Nations, in the world church, and in the many local churches, for the advance of peace. What we shall attempt to do here is to give some foundations, both in our Christian faith and in our world, on which cooperative action for peace can rest.

Basic Christian Convictions

Let us begin, then, with the ground on which we can stand as Christians. If we see clearly what our Christian

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

faith demands, we shall be less likely to be pushed this way and that by what comes over the radio and TV, or is in the newspapers, or is said in the campaign speeches of office-seekers. It will give us perspective from which to act with others, as such action becomes necessary and possible. "And when the strife is fierce, the warfare long," it can give us courage and faith to keep on acting, for we know that God is on the side of peace.

We shall not try to state the full range of Christian theology. However, there are certain basic notes in our faith that bear directly on the question of peacemaking.

(1) *This is God's world.*—Because God is the Creator of ourselves and of all physical nature, we know that he is concerned about the way we treat one another and the way we use the goods with which he has endowed us. We know that it *cannot* be his will that war's wanton destruction of persons and their homes, factories, and fields should occur. There is great meaning in the union of God's glory with earthly peace in the song of the angels on the first Christmas morning:

Glory to God in the highest,

and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.*

Because this is God's world, which he has given us to use in ways that accord with his kingdom, we are his stewards. Stewardship means far more than direct giving to good causes, although it includes that; it means regarding everything we have as a trust from God's hand. Thus it means that the resources of the earth, our technological skills and scientific achievements, and even

* Standard American Edition of the Revised Version of the Bible, Luke 2:14.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

atomic energy belong to God and should be used in his service.

(2) *God's will is love.*—War breeds hate, and cannot be waged without the doing of unloving acts. The individual soldier may not feel hate, and may even feel loving concern for the persons whose freedom he seeks to defend. This he should feel, if he fights from Christian conviction and not from mere compulsion. Yet war as a whole is bound to foster hate, and honesty and truth as well as love are among the first casualties. The Social Creed of The Methodist Church puts this pointedly:

We stand for these propositions: Christianity cannot be nationalistic; it must be universal in its outlook and appeal. War makes its appeal to force and hate, Christianity to reason and love.

(3) *God is a God of judgment.*—It is not enough to stress only the love of God. God is also a God of judgment who does not treat sin lightly. Any individual or any people who flouts his righteous will stands under condemnation, though his judgment is always linked with love. The result in practice is that sin always brings evil consequences in its wake. The world has been so made, with a pervasive moral order, that we cannot sin and "get away with it." When a society or a nation tries to direct its course on the basis of aggressive self-interest, denial of the rights and liberties of others, economic greed, lust for power, race prejudice, vindictiveness, and deception, situations are created which if unchecked lead to war. In this sense, then, war can be said to be a form of Divine judgment, though we cannot assume that

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

God deliberately sends it in order to smite people with the wrath of his displeasure.

If God's judgment is real, what must we do? The answer is, Repent. We cannot repent for the sins of our enemies; we can only treat them justly, pray for them, and try to be guided in our acts by the justice and the love of God. But we can repent for our own sins and those of our nation. A large part of corporate peace-making is a clear facing of our own wrongdoing and wrong-thinking, including our sins of omission and lethargy, with the resolve by God's help to be more Christian.

(4) *God alone is sovereign.*—In our present world every nation claims absolute sovereignty. But our Christian faith affirms that God alone is man's supreme Ruler and that his will alone is our final authority. When the State has called men to do what they believed to be contrary to the will of God, Christians have again and again felt impelled to say with Peter in the Book of Acts, "We must obey God rather than men."

This conviction leads some to refuse military service while others accept it as a Christian duty. Our church is pledged to hold those of both opinions within its fellowship. Paragraph 2026, *Discipline*, 1952, of The Methodist Church states that when one is faced with this dilemma "he must decide prayerfully before God what is to be his course of action . . ." but what a Christian may not do is "to obey men rather than God, or overlook the degree of compromise in our best acts, or gloss over the sinfulness of war."

If God alone is sovereign, this has a bearing on international cooperation. At present, though we have the U.N., each nation tends to do as it pleases in most mat-

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

ters of serious disagreement. This is the cause of much tension and strife. Peace-loving Christians must insist that no nation has a right to direct its course in defiance of that moral law which is the law of God.

(5) *Every person is precious to God.*—Every soul that God has created, whatever his race or nation, is precious in God's sight. We draw distinctions between our friends and our enemies. But those we call enemies are, like ourselves, mixtures of good and evil, persons whom God loves. We are all made in God's image; we have all in some measure marred it. All are persons whom God sent his Son to save, and for whom Christ died.

This means that we must never identify evil systems, of which Communism is certainly one, with the Russian or Chinese people who live under this system. Some misguidedly support Communism; many acquiesce in it because they see no way to do otherwise. But all are still our brothers, for whom we ought to pray and toward whom we ought to feel pity rather than ill-will. Furthermore, we must not forget that many millions of Russians and many thousands of Chinese are Christians who pray to the same God and read the same Bible as we do. Those who are atheists are still beloved of God, whose love is broad enough to take in all mankind.

(6) *God has shown us his way in Christ.*—This is not to say that every problem is settled for us automatically by the life and words of Jesus. What we can be sure of is that in Jesus, we see God. The way of Jesus is clearly that of self-giving service and love. And the more we live by his spirit, the clearer our way becomes.

The New Testament gives no blueprint as to what to do about war, but it does not lack directives. "Love your enemies . . . If your enemy is hungry, feed him . . .

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

Judge not, that you be not judged . . . As you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me . . . And he [God] made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth.** . . . Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind . . . Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good." Such passages as these, which are unquestionably in the spirit of Jesus, show us the direction in which our spirits and our deeds must move.

Common Ground in a Divided World

Carrying these principles in mind, let us look now at some of the problems and possibilities of our present world. We shall look first at the largest circle, the world of nations. Here the areas of agreement are smallest. But even here, the situation is not hopeless. And where there is any common ground to stand on, we may be sure God wants us to occupy it and use it for Christian ends.

(1) *The frightful character of modern war.*—There is a foundation for peace, not very dependable, but nevertheless existing, in the very fact that global war now means annihilation, the suicide of mankind. Men have been saying this for years, but with the coming of the hydrogen bomb, the expected production of the cobalt bomb, the devising of more and more deadly forms of bacteriological warfare, there is no doubt about it. Fear hangs over all mankind, although the strange thing about it is that in our preoccupation with comfortable living and immediate concerns, relatively few

** Standard American Edition, Revised Version of the Bible, Acts 17:26.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

people seem to think much about the proportions of disaster that would engulf us if war should come. Not only would the great cities and industrial centers of the world be destroyed too quickly for any possible evacuation, but competent scientists say also that the "creeping suicide" of radioactivity would injure the genes of survivors for generations to come. Our potential enemies know this as well as we do, and it is only common sense to assume that they do not want a war.

This is not to say, as some too lightly do, that our chief security is in bombs and massive armaments. The power to kill with such efficiency begets fear, and fear accelerates not only the armaments race with its colossal economic drain but also the suspicions and tensions which are fertile breeders of war. There would be far more security in willingness to negotiate with some measure of mutual confidence, and an active, multilateral effort to reduce armaments. What we are saying here is simply that the *fact* of modern war, known to be what it is, can be a ground of hope when it is connected with a positive, constructive effort to lay the foundations of peace.

(2) *The possibility of economic progress for all mankind.*—We live in an age which is inevitably a technological era. This fact has both good and evil consequences, but the good outweigh the evil. Because of the availability of machines and scientific knowledge for virtually every aspect of our physical existence—industry, agriculture, transportation, communication, medicine, housework, even the arts, as music comes into our homes with the turning of a dial—production of many kinds of goods has been increased. The life span has been lengthened, and leisure time is more available if we will take it. There are also a frenzied haste and a nervous

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

unsettledness about modern society which are in part products of technology, but these features do not obliterate the fact that we would not want to go back to a pre-scientific age if we could.

The bearing of this on common grounds for peace lies along both a negative and a positive front. First, the hungry, underdeveloped peoples of the earth, primarily in the Orient, know about these things and desire them. When they are led, even by deceptive promises, to believe that Communism will lift their living standards, Communism presents a great attraction. This is a challenge to the democracies of the West to see that technical assistance is made much more available than our relatively meager appropriations at the present have made possible. The other, brighter side of the picture is President Eisenhower's bold and truly great proposal of the sharing of atomic energy for peace, and the fact that in this aspect of the work of the United Nations the U.S.S.R. is giving some cooperation.

For the first time in human history, science has made possible sufficient production so that if economic goods were properly distributed, the resources of the earth would be enough for all. In this fact lies not only the possibility of war in a struggle to possess them, but also a great portent of peace if those who have both goods and scientific knowledge will share with those who lack them.

(3) *The power of moral principles.*—It is, of course, an evident and ominous fact that the moral principles on which the Communist nations operate are different from ours. If there were a real "international ethos," which means common moral principles of action, the danger of war would be greatly lessened. However, even here there are grounds of hope.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

With all its difficulties the United Nations has nevertheless been able to prevent some possible wars, and indirectly to contribute much to peace through services to health, education, and economic conditions. But perhaps its greatest service is to be a sounding-board for the moral sentiments of the world. Public opinion is a potent force, and the stand each nation takes on issue after issue is known around the world in a few seconds. Sometimes, unfortunately, hostility is thus generated, but taking a stand on the side of justice and humanitarian concern can also be a powerful source of good will. And it is significant that every nation, however unethical its position may seem to others, always appeals to moral principles. People will not with any zeal support a cause or sacrifice their lives for what they believe to be false and wrong.

Are there, then, no common moral principles? There are, and these have been defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It may be a long time before these are accepted in practice by all nations. Yet to agree on *what ought to be* is the first step, and a long step, toward bringing it to fulfilment.

(4) *The possibility of co-existence.*—Some do not like the word co-existence because it has been used by the Communists. But why let its use by others spoil a good word? Co-existence does not mean approval of Communism, or any unconcern before the advance of Communism through aggression or subversion. What it does mean is that two different systems can live together in the same world without going to war to annihilate each other.

The Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches put it this way:

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

Christians must continue to condemn totalitarianism as false in doctrine and dangerous in practice. They will be no less firm in continuing to oppose atheistic materialism. Yet however deep the conflict may be it is not necessarily an insuperable bar to living together in a divided world. The same may be said of methods of political and economic organization, whether they be democratic or dictatorial.¹

Such living together is, of course, not all that is meant by peace. Peace in the full sense comes only through reconciliation and good will, and this we must continue to work for while we co-exist. It may be that the tensions we call the cold war may last a long time. Yet who in his senses would not prefer a cold war to a hot one? And *that*, apparently, is the alternative if we do not accept co-existence.

Our Responsibilities as Americans

We noted as the second circle of cooperation the need of working with other citizens who do not share the Christian faith but have much else in common with us. Let us look now at what we must all do together.

A great characteristic of our country is the fact that we need not all think alike. To live in this free land has made individualists of some Americans. But we have also a great deal in common, which has encouraged a social outlook. We shall glance at those matters most directly related to peace. In none is there full agreement, but enough for a common basis of action.

(1) *Rejection of the inevitability of war.*—There was a time, toward the beginning of Soviet-American tensions, when some thought that war was so inevitable

¹ Report of Section IV on "International Affairs," paragraph 25.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

that "preventive" war must be launched. Occasionally one hears this still advocated. However, most Americans, including our most responsible leaders of government, have repudiated this as ghastly folly.

(2) *Willingness to share our surplus.*—It can hardly be said that we have often voluntarily given to others until deep sacrifice was involved. Yet Americans as a whole are a generous people, and in the aggregate have given many millions of dollars and many tons of food and clothing to those in need. This relief has included ministry to former enemies, as to Germany after both the first and second world wars. Appropriations of government funds for such relief have been small in proportion to those for armaments, yet gifts based on humanitarian concern as well as security have been voted and sent. What has been done needs greatly to be extended, both as a ministry of helpfulness to human beings and as one of the surest bulwarks against Communism and hence the outbreak of war.

(3) *Preservation of civil liberties.*—This is a very basic requirement if we are not to surrender freedom and democracy in the effort to preserve them. In principle most Americans agree that our cherished freedoms must not be infringed upon; hence there is great concern that Communist subversion and infiltration be checked. In practice there is danger of becoming totalitarian by the methods used. Paragraph 2026, *Discipline*, 1952 thus contrasts two kinds of "thought control":

In some lands thought control uses the techniques of absolute censorship, surveillance by secret police, torture, imprisonment and death. In other lands the techniques are those of social rejection, calling of names, demands for "loyalty

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

oaths," denial of employment, irresponsible accusations, and assertion of "guilt by association."

Yet even at this point, imperfect though the situation still is, the good sense of the American people seems to be asserting itself in a repudiation of such methods.

(4) *Negotiation and collective security*.—Collective security is sometimes thought of solely in military terms. The majority of Americans regard military measures as a necessary part of such security. Yet all thoughtful persons see in it much more than the use of military force. It involves the entire structure of the U.N. and of those intangibles by which friendships among nations are cemented. It requires not only diplomacy at its best, but also the support of internationally-minded citizens. Its scope was well outlined by the 1953 Study Conference of the National Council of Churches:

We ask our own government to take the lead in emphasizing all those activities of the UN which aim at the substitution of good offices, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and the counsel of the world community for armed force as a means of settling disputes. Without the development of peaceful alternatives, collective military effort may win a temporary victory, only to plunge the victors into new conflict.²

(5) *Flexibility and change*.—Among many uncertainties, there is the certainty that changes will occur. Firmness of principle must be combined with flexibility of procedure. Several recent revolutionary changes bear directly on our problem.

² "Christian Faith and International Responsibility." p. 16. Report of the Fourth National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order, Cleveland, Ohio, October 27-30, 1953.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

Outstanding among these are rapid shifts from colonial status to independence among the peoples of the Orient. Since the second world war, independence has come to India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, the Philippines, Indonesia, South Korea, and South Vietnam, with at least nominal freedom also in North Korea and Viet-Minh. The United States, though constantly charged with "Western imperialism" by the U.S.S.R., has never been largely a colonizing country, and many, if not most, Americans can sympathize with this "new birth of freedom" among formerly subject peoples. The accompanying responsibility is to give such moral, technical, and political support as may aid the development of this new freedom without infringing on it.

Another great change, by no means yet completed, is the growth of a sense of international responsibility. Whatever their motives, Americans in general recognize that our destiny is bound up with that of the rest of the world. Both in moral attitudes and in organization, progress has been made. Only a little over a half-century ago, in 1899, the first Hague Peace Conference was held. Since then there has occurred the formation, not only of the U.N., but also of more than a thousand international organizations, some unofficial, some inter-governmental. Future historians may regard the twentieth century not only as the atomic age and the technological era, but also as the first great period of international co-operation.

A third element, partly realized and partly only longed for, lies in our flexibility with regard to enemies. The Germans and the Japanese, enemies of ten years ago, are now our friends. The friendship of the U. S. with China is too deep-seated to be permanently de-

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

stroyed, and our leaders have repeatedly said that we have no quarrel with the Russian people. Who knows but that the people of Russia and China, convinced of our friendship and tired of Communism, might repudiate it? We must not give way to wishful thinking, but we may hope.

In any event, if we do our best the issues are with God. He is able to take even our feeble effort, if it is given in love and faithfulness, and use it for his kingdom. We do not need in every case to see the outcome. As Paul "planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the growth," so it is with our effort for peace. All we are required to do is to work together with our best wisdom and in faith, hope, and love. God will do the rest.

Questions to Be Considered While Reading

WORKING TOGETHER FOR PEACE

1. Is it possible that groups working together for peace in one part of the world can counteract causes of war which exist in some far distant section? How?
2. Can you list certain Christian principles which would be generally accepted by Christians everywhere which can be a guide toward working with others for peace?
3. Which ones of these principles are acceptable to all men of good-will, non-Christian and Christian—as a working basis for combined peace efforts?
4. Is it possible to draw up a list of Christian principles which would serve as a guide for those occasions, in our working toward peace, when it seems that one must compromise?

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

5. What theological directives do you feel are particularly helpful in deciding what to do about war?
6. If public opinion is as powerful as the author feels it is, how can we, as Christians, use it as a deterrent to war?
7. What are other deterrents to war which can be supported actively by individual Americans?
8. Do you agree that the World Council of Churches was right in its statement on the possibility of living together in a divided world? If so, have you made the statement known to other church members?
9. Do you think the idea of "flexibility" of enemies is helpful in creating a philosophy of peace?

CHAPTER II

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

BY CAMERON P. HALL

Soon after we became a nation, ten Amendments were added to our Constitution. Known as the Bill of Rights, these continue to play a decisive role in providing constitutional safeguards to our basic freedoms. But experience shows that unless a people has and exercises a sense of social responsibility, its freedoms may be lost. Should we have also a Bill of Responsibilities? It may well be that our first national leaders felt that the character of the American people could be trusted to remain sensitive to this need. It may be that they felt that while the preservation of freedom comes within the law of the land, the cultivation of a sense of responsibility is within the province of the home, the school, and the church.

Be that as it may, we are a nation which has located the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of its affairs in us, the people. Authoritarian governments invest power, hence responsibility, in their leaders, with little responsibility (in totalitarian countries none) upon the citizen except to conform and acquiesce. In sharp contrast, we give our leaders extra responsibility, but they can be—and often are—relieved of this, and others chosen in their place. This way of locating responsibility has been described, in the enduring words of Abraham Lincoln, as government “of the people, for the people, by the people.”

As have other democracies, we have built our nation—

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

al institutions and customs to locate in the people themselves responsibility for their common life. And we do this because we make an assumption about the individual. We assume that he is capable of acting responsibly. We believe that the people, having the responsibility, will prove adequate and worthy in its use. This is, in essence, a vote of faith in the innate moral worth of human nature; it represents a high, rather than a low, view of the individual.

Both in its location of social responsibility and in its underlying assumption about the moral capacity of men, our non-authoritarian-democratic society is a responsible society. This leaves open and pressing the question: How do we, the people, maintain and train that sense of responsibility needed by us to keep our society responsible, not only in its structure and basic assumptions but also in fact and in practice? And what is the contribution of the churches to the development and exercise of an adequate sense of social responsibility within a society?

This issue may be pointed up in another question: If our government is responsible to the people, to what, or to whom, is each citizen responsible? The nation would reply that, although each individual must choose among the several groups competing for his responsible action—his racial group, his community, his family, his business, his economic group—the nation includes all of these, therefore its good has the prior and deeper claim.

For the Christian this stops far short of his ultimate loyalty or responsibility. For one thing, his nation is but one of many nations, and to be responsible wholly to a particular one is, as Edith Cavell said of patriotism,

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

not enough. For another thing, to fence in one's sense of responsibility within one's nation is to act as though the nation were capable of standing for and doing what is wholly good. Because of the way in which the Christian views human nature, he knows that this can be true of no people at any time and in any place.

The Christian lives, then, on the deepest level of an effective sense of responsibility. To be responsible is for him to be responsible to God. In Christ and through the Holy Spirit, God shows us his purpose and his power. The Christian sees our common life as under the judgment of God. He looks upon the race into which he was born, the ideology—capitalistic, socialistic, or any other—to which he subscribes, the economic group with which he identifies his well-being, and the nation of which he is a citizen and seeks to evaluate each of these as they stand before God. His response to each should be conditioned by his prior response to God in Christ—his truth, his righteousness, his love.

II

From this perspective the Christian frequently sees his social responsibility toward *both* sides of issues, whereas others tend to overemphasize *one* side. One such issue is raised by Communism. On the basis of Christian and democratic traditions, Christians take a strongly responsible position against Communism. They become anti-Communists. But within *some* forms of anti-Communism there may be equal danger to Christian and democratic traditions. The zeal and methods of all too many anti-Communists go far beyond the legitimate and necessary concern with the threat of Communism. The current threat to freedom—in some instances its

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

actual loss—especially among public officials and employees, editors, teachers, school administrators, and radio and television leaders is evidence of the impairment of freedom by those who consciously or unconsciously have exploited fear of Communists and their fellow travelers.

The technique of these anti-Communists (who come under responsible Christian opposition) is broadly this: first, to set up oneself or one's group as the self-appointed guardian of what is "American" or "loyal" or "anti-Communist"; second, to win acceptance for the thesis that since there is no middle ground, those who do not fit into their standards are therefore "unAmerican" or "subversive" or "Communists"; and third, by use of smears, false accusations, unjust imputation of guilt through association, and the repetition of falsehoods to discredit these persons, to undermine what they have espoused, and to establish further one's own position as a leader of "loyal Americanism." Support of the United Nations, differences of opinions in political life, making available in libraries books that are deemed controversial, deviations from *laissez faire* capitalism—all these have been charged as "Communist" by those who are often more effective against the garden variety of dissenters than against real Communists.

The danger in Communism to freedom of thought, speech, and conscience is real and calls for responsible concern. But the danger that lies in certain forms of anti-Communism in the United States is likewise a challenge to a sense of responsibility for these freedoms. Indeed, these seem in essence to be as much anti-United Nations, anti-intellectualism, and anti-dissent as their professed anti-Communism. If allowed to advance another ten

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

years, as it has in the past ten, this form of "anti-ism" will debase irreparably all that is Christian and democratic in the freedoms the citizen enjoys, as well as the spirit of mutuality and trust between him and his fellow citizens. Already so much ground has been lost that it is not enough to take responsibility for holding the present line of freedom, the line must be restored to its original position.

This necessitates an active sense of responsibility toward freedom, on two fronts. One of these calls for the individual Christian to exercise freedom of speech and conscience. Responsibility for these freedoms goes far beyond believing in them, it extends to using them. They could be lost by people who believe in them but are indifferent or timid about exercising them. Exercising them calls, of course, for wisdom as well as courage, for tact as well as outspokenness.

A second front of responsible support of freedom exists in defending the right of an individual to say what others do not want to read or hear. The issue of freedom of speech is joined when this right is claimed. Christian responsibility for freedom will go out in support of that claim, quite apart from such consideration as whether it comes from the "right" or from the "left."

III

Another issue facing us is the question of how far government should extend itself into economic life, that segment of our common life where breadwinners produce and sell and housewives buy. In its more generalized form, the question concerns where and how we apply the principle of individual freedom on the one

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

hand, and the principle of social justice on the other.

In our American tradition there is a deeply embedded tension between these two principles. We have shown throughout our history a strong distrust of the power of government over individual freedom. Look at the elaborate system of checks and balances we created for the Executive in the White House, the Congress in the Capitol, and the justices on the Supreme Court. These checks are designed to keep government under control, thereby maintaining the freedom of the individual. Over against these, also deep within our tradition, is the value we give to equality. As a people we are allergic to any measurable inequality—social, economic, political. The graduated income tax is one of many striking evidences of the strength of this conviction. Because we are against too much government and also against too much inequality, we travel a road designed to hold freedom and justice in dynamic balance.

In a recent issue of *Fortune* magazine there is an article illustrating how this issue comes to a head and how it may be resolved. The article is written by George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor. He admits that at one time the A. F. of L. opposed social security. The reason? Because its members felt that through free collective bargaining between labor and management, industry should pay sufficient wages and provide adequate pensions so that government intervention would be no more necessary than it was deemed desirable. But this reliance upon the two parties' acting together did not bring justice to individuals who have to meet hazards and handicaps beyond their control. So out of its experience with the limits of freedom in securing justice, this labor organization turned toward

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

government-sponsored programs of social security. But not without reservations, Mr. Meany writes. The A. F. of L. still feels that the worker is secured in both freedom and justice if his social security needs are provided, not by government alone or by collective bargaining alone, but by both. Freedom and justice, individual initiative and government action—all are arrows in the Christian's quiver of social responsibility. Since all of them are principles of his faith, he will not be so naive as to yield either to an extreme economic individualism or to an extreme reliance upon government. It is part of his accepted responsibility to be aware that the issue exists and to resolve its tension in concrete situations in the light of the largest measure both of individual freedom and the general welfare.

IV

A further issue exists where management and labor meet. They meet directly in the shop and factory, and, through their representatives, they are related in collective bargaining. But it is not always recalled that they meet also where legislation is debated and enacted. First the Wagner Act, and later the Taft-Hartley Act have made it evident that these two groups clash sharply in the halls of Congress. And not only in Washington, but also in the state legislatures. The so-called "Right to Work" laws are a current reminder that people elected by farm, suburban, and educational as well as urban and industrial groups are setting the framework within which the law allows these two parties to bargain collectively. What "Taft-Hartley" is to the nation, these laws, pushed by management and opposed by labor, are to the states. Important in itself, this issue dramatically

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

shows how involved is the Christian, as a citizen, in what management and labor are allowed or forbidden to do in their relationships.

Church people dare not be indifferent to their responsibility in industrial relations, which are so heavily involved in the human equation, whether these relations exist in the factory, at the collective bargaining table, or in law-making chambers. Because their responsibility is in the first instance to God, the churches belong to neither side. God is no more nor no less on the side of the one than he is on the side of the other. Those whose sense of responsibility is directed by their responsibility to him will be partisan to justice for each side and to the welfare of all, not partisan either to labor as labor or management as management.

But when we pass from basic conviction to the actual situation which the churches face, a difficulty arises. So many of our churches are predominantly middle class in their membership. The professional man and the businessman swell the ranks of congregations and official church boards, and their wives those of Woman's Societies of Christian Service and Wesleyan Service Guilds.

This general description is subject to important qualifications. There are numerous local churches in which the opposite is true, and others are broadly inclusive of the chief occupations within their community. Also there are sizable differences among denominations. But in wide segments of church life today its middle-class composition needs to be taken account of by those who are concerned over the Christian conscience toward the claims of labor and management. The following questions

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

are thrown out, almost at random, as tests of a sense of direction in this matter:

On what basis do we decide what we will do when we find a picket line in front of the restaurant, store, or amusement place which we are about to enter? If we enter, we put ourselves on the side of the employer; if we go elsewhere, we put ourselves on the side of the strikers. But choose we must! It is suggested here that *what* we do is not so basic as *why* we do it. Is the choice made with no thought that one is taking sides in a situation in which people on both sides are deeply involved? Or is the choice made largely out of bias, as a few moments' reflection may show? Or is it made out of careful probing of what is at stake in the light of one's sense of responsibility to God, within whose justice and care both sides are enfolded?

A certain woman, hearing that a labor leader had been appointed to a local board of education, exclaimed, "But he will be pro-labor!" This citizen had not expressed herself about a businessman who had been appointed earlier. I think that it can be said with confidence that those who know personally members and leaders of organized labor would not have such a reaction. But many church members, lacking personal acquaintance with labor leaders, have this view. Many of us doubt that members of organized labor can be as objective in their views and as inclusive in their goals as persons in other situations.

If we neither meet and talk with labor representatives—in our community or in our church—nor read the papers distributed by their unions, how can we know what their thoughts and "arousements" are? Their interests are broadly those of all of us, but there is a dif-

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

ference in what they emphasize; it lies in their possibly putting at the top of a list of the ten most important social, economic, and political issues, what an educator or banker may put fifth or sixth, while they may place at the bottom of the list what a farmer or minister may put at the top. If we are not asking the same questions, how can our minds and will to action have a basis for common answers and programs? A Christian sense of responsibility will give rise to curiosity, at least, about what is on another's mind and heart and conscience. We may not arrive at the same answers, but we will gain understanding of each other's concerns.

V

A further issue concerns the current interest in religion and in church attendance and support. Filled churches, breakfast prayer meetings, industrial chaplaincies and other religion-in-industry programs, "Go to Church" campaigns sponsored by business and commercial firms, religious books as continuing best sellers—these and many other instances add up to a new dimension in the place of religion in American life.

For this the Christian will give thanks to God. It means more opportunities for the Word to be proclaimed in word and sacrament. It means more occasions when the power of the Holy Spirit may be felt in new ways. The promise in this revival of religious interest is great, but the Christian with a sense of social responsibility will recognize that the reality of religion lies not in statistics but within the human heart; that in what Christianity means to people there can be great error as well as great truth. In a public statement issued shortly after his election as president of the National Council of Churches,

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake made the following comments:

"To try to use God for any purpose, however noble, is always wrong. This is true if one tries to use God to win votes, or to bolster one's own economic position (labor or capital).

"There is probably nothing much more important for us in the Western World than to withstand and ultimately defeat Communism, but here again, to try to use God for religion even for this vital purpose is to make an instrument out of God.

"Our concern must be to become God's instruments.

"Christianity is the worship and service of God as revealed in Christ. And that God will not be used."

To be responsible in the first instance to God is to hail the promise implicit in today's movement of multitudes toward the churches, but also to be aware and on guard against the dangers that may lie in it. There is a great temptation to use religion as a sort of public-relations aid for one's individual occupational ambitions. So also is the temptation to use it chiefly as another way of fighting Communism—as though the sole purpose of the churches is to combat Communism! There is a further temptation to stress religion merely as a means toward personal spiritual security, with no stirrings of the conscience to new forms of social responsibility within one's community and nation. "Jesus wept," the Scriptures tell us, as he looked out upon Jerusalem, the religious center of his people.

VI

Where and how may we find opportunities today to express the sense of social responsibility that is within us? The World Council of Churches, meeting at Evans-

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

ton, Illinois, spoke with great conviction on the obligation of the Christian to be concerned with the underlying causes of war, enmity, and unrest.

"It is not enough," the message says, "that Christians should seek peace for themselves. They must seek justice for others. Great masses of people in many parts of the world are hungry for bread and are compelled to live in conditions which mock their human worth. Does your church speak and act against such injustice? Millions of men and women are suffering segregation and discrimination on the ground of race. Is your church willing to declare, as this Assembly has declared, that this is contrary to the will of God and to act on that declaration? Do you pray regularly for those who suffer unjust discrimination on grounds of race, religion, or political conviction?"

The response, in terms of local churches, to the courage and insight displayed at Evanston will be one of the most important manifestations of the next few years. As the World Council said at its first meeting: "Our coming together to form a world council will have been in vain unless Christians and Christian congregations everywhere commit themselves to the Lord of the Church and in a new effort seek together where they live to be His witnesses and servants among their neighbors. . . ."

It would be impossible to list, as the most important, certain of Evanston's challenges to our sense of Christian responsibility, because the report touches on the needs for Christian concern and action in a variety of important fields. Several of them, however, point up methods that can be used in the effort for peace.

One of the most important of these is the elimination,

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

from our national life, of the sin and disgrace of segregation. The United States is in an extremely sensitive position. The eyes and the ears of the world are upon us. Because of our wealth, power, and historical leadership in the development of the concepts and practice of democracy, the rest of the world looks with dismay and disillusionment at our violations of basic human rights, particularly in the area of race, and our failure to put the weight of our national effort behind attempts to secure these rights for others through international channels. At its 1955 annual meeting the Woman's Division called attention to special excerpts of the intergroup action statement made at Evanston and urged Methodist women to make use of its resources. The Board of Missions also adopted the statement:

" . . . Everywhere there is restlessness in the world. This is due in great part to the hunger of millions of people for status and recognition, for a meaning for both life and work, and for a fuller share of the fruits of the earth.

" . . . The hatreds, jealousies and suspicions with which the world has always been afflicted are deepened by racial prejudices and fears, rooted in the sinful human heart and entrenched in law and custom. . . .

" . . . Many churches and many Christians have striven to be obedient to God's will in matters of race; for every such obedience we give our thanks, both for God's power and his servants' faithfulness. Increasingly racial and ethnic barriers are breached in the life of the churches. But it is the most obedient who would best understand the need of all churches and Christians for deep repentance that they are so largely conformed to the world's compromises. This same world watches any

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

denial of human brotherhood, and is not deceived. . . .

" When we are given Christian insight the whole pattern of racial discrimination is seen as an unutterable offense against God, to be endured no longer, so that the very stones cry out. In such moments we understand more fully the meaning of the gospel, and the duty of both church and Christian.

" Racial and ethnic fears, hates and prejudices are more than social problems with whose existence we must reckon; they are sins against God and his commandments that the gospel alone can cure. To the church has been committed the preaching of the gospel; to proclaim 'the healing of the nations' through Christ is verily her task. The gospel has a power of its own, which manifests itself despite the shortcomings of the churches.

" The churches have this twofold duty, to obey and to proclaim the word of judgment, to repent and to call to repentance. It is their task to challenge the conscience of society; if there is no tension between the church and society, then to create and to keep open every possible line of communication between people, between political opponents, between people of differing views, cultures, races, languages, between the conservative and the venturesome.

" The churches have a special duty toward those of their members who feel called to challenge actively the conscience of society and who thus offend against custom, and incur loneliness and suffering. It is a great duty of the church to offer its love and fellowship, and even its admonition in the light of the gospel, to all who strive to be obedient whatever the world's opinion.

" The Church of Christ cannot approve of any

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

law which discriminates on grounds of race, which restricts the opportunity of any man to acquire education to prepare himself for his vocation, to procure or to practice employment in his vocation, or in any other way curtails his exercise of the full rights and responsibilities of citizenship and to share in the responsibilities and duties of government. . . ."

The tasks in these fields will be many. There will be the problem of creating within the church and its institutions a fellowship without barriers. In this respect the study, adoption, and implementation of the Charter of Racial Policies of the Woman's Division will be an important first step for Methodist women. Essential for true world peace are the desegregation of schools and the elimination of segregated housing which creates segregation in schools, even in places where no machinery to segregate exists, and where the average citizen has never realized that he lives within a system of segregated education. At a recent gathering of church leaders there was discussion of a statement against certain tactics opposing desegregation. One speaker advocated some word changes in the statement because, he said, "while these people are wrong in their judgment, some of them are sincere Christians." Another speaker rose and said, in substance, "There may well be sincerity among those whose actions we here are criticizing, but I am quite unimpressed by that fact. I see this desegregation issue as a world-wide issue. It far transcends how we feel individually or what our communities are used to."

Other steps which must be taken are the promotion of the study of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the proposed Covenants on Human Rights, and a constant appraisal of our government's policies in inter-

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

national affairs, wherever those policies could give aid and comfort to those struggling to make effective in their countries the provisions of the Universal Declaration.

The Evanston report pertinently states: "Christians have a duty to bring to the attention of their governments that national policies have effects on the lives and welfare of peoples in other countries. National economic and political stability, justice, freedom and peace are dependent upon world economic and political stability. National and international policies are far more closely interrelated than ever before. Excessive barriers to trade can create economic crises elsewhere. The greater the economic power, the larger is the responsibility in this field. The richer countries particularly must remember that one test of their policies is their effect on the underdeveloped areas of the world."

The interdependence of the world's peoples and the effect that our policies may have in remote parts of the world must be fully understood by many people in our country if we are to build effective foundations for peace. The study of the problem of trade and the need for lowering of trade barriers is a very good place to begin this study, because it affects the life of every individual. A short view of the effects of our policies and actions may have been a responsible one in the days of the stagecoach and packet ship, but it is no longer possible in this day of communication, transportation, and propaganda technique.

The Evanston Assembly listed a number of areas of special concern, some of which are relatively new to the thinking of the organized church. One of these is: "the temptations facing everyone in a rich society. The

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

tendencies to create unlimited wants, to overemphasize material values and to appeal to motives of social pride, envy and lust, stimulated by irresponsible salesmanship and advertising, are dangerous and need curbing."

A study of the temptations in a rich society and some of the ways in which we are using our national wealth might be highly revealing, leading to a reappraisal of our national—and individual—stewardship of the riches for which God has given us temporary responsibility.

The size of the task suggested by these quotations and other equally pertinent ones not included here is enough to frighten anyone except the Christian who sees the task in the words from Evanston: "Because Jesus Christ is Lord in earth and heaven, the call to responsible social action which God addresses to His church does not present us with an impossible task. We are not called upon to shoulder the burden of this world but to seek justice, freedom, and peace to the best of our ability in the social order."

Questions to Be Considered While Reading

A SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

1. Do you agree with the author that the American people need to be on guard constantly for violations of the Bill of Rights?

2. Would you put such watchfulness in the field of social responsibility?

3. Can you see the relationship between taking a high view of individuals as a whole and social responsibility?

4. In the light of the American philosophy of the

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

importance of individual initiative, what criteria would you use for determining when to support government controls?

5. Do you feel that the Protestant church in America has a class viewpoint? If you do, how would you go about broadening understanding of another class? Does Question 3 have any relation to this question?

6. Is there any way to relate democratic principles to the Christian religion without making an instrument of religion for national reasons?

7. How can an individual map out a plan for social responsibility in his neighborhood?

8. To whom is the individual socially responsible in the final analysis?

CHAPTER III

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

By ERNEST W. LEFEVER

Several years ago Sarah Chakko, the late president of the World Council of Churches from India, was visiting some Arab refugees living in a makeshift camp on the hot sands of a Middle Eastern desert. Those homeless, stateless, and desolate people were bitter. They blamed the United States and Britain as well as the Zionists for their miserable plight. "Why doesn't the United Nations *do something?*" they demanded. And Sarah Chakko answered with compassion and wisdom, "The United Nations is not God."

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt has often reminded us that "the United Nations is not a cure-all. It is only an instrument capable of effective action when its members have a will to make it work. It cannot be any better than the individual nations are."

Today many people in our churches are disillusioned with the U.N. They are disappointed because the organization in which they invested so much hope and loyalty has not brought peace and security to our troubled world. Has the U.N. really failed? It has failed only for those who expected too much. The record of the U.N. is disappointing only to those who do not understand what the organization can and cannot do. People who understand its inescapable limitations are more than pleased with what has been accomplished.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

A Conference of Sixty Sovereign States

The U.N. is basically a continuing conference of sixty sovereign nations pledged to uphold the high principles of the U.N. Charter. Effective international action to meet a threat to the peace or to fight malaria can take place through the U.N. only when the governments of the member states so desire. The power of decision does not rest with the U.N., but with the governments of its members, particularly with the governments of the superpowers like the United States and the Soviet Union. This is what we mean by the term "national sovereignty." The U.N., like any other conference of sovereign states, is stalemated when the governments concerned cannot agree. The U.N. is not a superstate or even a weak world government, so it must necessarily reflect the struggles and conflicts of a tragically divided world.

Even with this basic and inescapable limitation the U.N. has been and is playing an important role in the quest for peace. There are two major ways of working for international security and peace, and the U.N. has played a part in both. First, there is the long-range job of weaving the fabric of peace and community through developing respect for human rights, raising living standards, increasing knowledge, and building the habits and processes of government by consent. Second, there is the immediate and urgent task of keeping the peace. The first job is primarily a non-political task, and the second is primarily political. Both are necessary, and neither is a substitute for the other. Let us consider each in turn.

The United Nations and the Fabric of Peace

The far-flung social-economic-humanitarian work of the U.N. is eloquently illustrated in a humorous inci-

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

dent which took place not long ago in an isolated African village. A U.N. representative was touring a rural area to tell the villagers about the health and agricultural services available from the district U.N. station. As he spoke through an interpreter to his attentive audience, he pictured the over-all humanitarian program of the organization. His speech was greeted with enthusiasm; after he sat down the villagers kept shouting the same thing over and over. Unable to understand what was going on, the speaker consulted his interpreter. "They are asking when they can be baptized," replied the embarrassed interpreter. The people had mistaken a U.N. technician for a missionary, and they were so impressed with the program of his "church" they wanted to join it.

These primitive African villagers had grasped a basic truth. U.N. technicians *are* a new kind of missionary. They are in no sense a substitute for, but rather a worthy colleague of, Christian missionary doctors, agriculturalists, and educators.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the U.N. is its humanitarian ministry carried on through the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and all the specialized agencies and commissions. Americans are comparatively well informed about the work of agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), UNESCO, and the Technical Assistance Program. But there is a tendency to overlook the less dramatic, and yet equally important, work of agencies like the International Monetary Fund (Fund), and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Bank).

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

While church women are acquainted with the contribution of commissions like the ones on Human Rights and the Status of Women the ordinary citizen knows little about these too.

The Record Speaks for Itself

This is not the place to list all the social and economic achievements of U.N. agencies, but it may be well to take a quick look at the record. In its three-pronged attack against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, and illiteracy—the U.N. has made a great contribution. Ernest A. Gross, former U.S. deputy representative to the U.N., said that the "program of expanded technical assistance to underdeveloped areas has kindled the imagination of the world's people, simply because a steel plow will cut a deeper furrow than a lofty statement of good intentions."

To get an idea of the scope of the U.N.'s humanitarian ministry, let us note some of the accomplishments of various agencies. Successful attacks on typhus, yaws, treponematoses, trachoma, and malaria by co-operating teams of workers from the United Nations Children's Fund, WHO, and governments were reported in 1954. Teams of Afghan health workers dusted homes, mosques, public baths, and horse-drawn hacks with DDT in the area of Kabul, the capital. Not one case of typhus was reported the following spring. Only a few years ago louse-borne typhus was epidemic in the area. In Haiti, 35,000 to 55,000 persons afflicted with yaws were treated monthly with penicillin and almost 100,000 incapacitated persons returned to work.

Mass campaigns against treponematoses have lightened social and economic burdens in Bechuanaland, Ecuador,

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Laos, Liberia, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Thailand, and Yugoslavia.

In 1954, UNESCO invited four top reporters to cover the battle against ignorance on its far-flung fronts over three continents. From Asia, one of the men reported: "All over India the lamplit classes in the villages are multiplying, as well as in other countries of the region as well. It can be said, literally as well as metaphorically, that the lights are going up in South and Southeast Asia."

From West Africa, another reporter wrote: "A technique has been born, which can help directly or indirectly influence the evolution of 16,000,000 human beings."

He was referring to the newest enthusiasm in the village—the movies. All through Africa the people are becoming movie fans. Schools open at nightfall, when the projectors can flash the night's lesson onto the big sheet stretched across the mango trees. In one village, the women threw themselves in the road in front of the truck carrying the projector to another village to keep their movies from leaving them. From traveling teachers and popular educational movies women are learning to sew, embroider, knit, use scissors, write—on the soles of their sandals, because they have no tables. They are learning how to count, an invaluable aid in such tasks as giving their babies the right amount of food.

Also in 1954, the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency allocated \$22,900 to establish a post-graduate school of nursing in the Korean National Health Center at Seoul. The funds made available by UNKRA were used to equip the center with teaching

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

materials and classroom furnishings and provided tuition and subsistence for twenty students for one academic year.

"To Develop Self-Government"

Halfway between the non-political work of the specialized agencies and commissions of the U.N. and the political work of the Security Council and General Assembly stands the Trusteeship Council, which deals with the rights of peoples in non-self-governing territories. Member states of the U.N. which administer "colonial" (non-self-governing) areas are pledged under the Charter to recognize that "the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount" and to accept "as a sacred trust" their duty to promote the well-being of these people. Further, administering powers are pledged to respect the "culture of the peoples concerned" and "to develop self-government." They are required by the Charter to submit to the U.N. reports on conditions in the subject territories. In short, the U.N. Charter assumes that old-fashioned colonialism is on the way out and that colonial powers are obligated to prepare their colonies for self-government as soon as possible.

The U.N. also has a "trusteeship system" under which certain "trust territories" are supervised. Eleven such territories are administered by seven powers under the supervision of the Trusteeship Council. The Trusteeship Council has two tasks. One has to do with colonies in general. Here the council has little jurisdiction beyond reviewing reports made by the colonial powers since the important colonies have not been transferred by the colonial powers to the trusteeship system. Never-

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

theless the council has been most effective in the very review of colonial achievements and policies. The other task is to supervise the eleven trust territories. Each administering power is required to fill out a lengthy questionnaire on every relevant aspect of life in the territories. Annual reports on each territory are examined by the U.N., and petitions, written or oral, are received and examined by the Trusteeship Council. Periodic "visiting missions" are sent by the council to the trust territories.

A government, like a human being, is more likely to keep its house in order when it knows that the house will be thoroughly inspected. The right of petition has also borne fruit. The trust territory of Western Samoa (administered by New Zealand), for example, petitioned the Trusteeship Council for the creation of a legislative assembly with local representation. A U.N. mission visited Western Samoa. After conversations with the Samoans and with New Zealand authorities, the legislative assembly was established. There is further a psychological advantage to the peoples of the territory in knowing that they have the right of appeal.

Great Britain granted independence to India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon without the aid of the United Nations, but the existence of the Trusteeship Council does provide a means for speeding up and encouraging the development toward genuine self-determination among subject peoples.

Through the United Nations many important advances have been made in man's long march toward greater economic well-being, but in terms of the overwhelming need, especially in Asia and Africa, the surface has barely been scratched. Much more could be done if

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

wealthy nations would contribute more generously to the specialized agencies. And, of course, bilateral programs like the U.S. Point 4 Program accomplish substantially the same purposes as U.N. efforts if they are carried out in a spirit of humility and partnership.

Our efforts to eliminate stark poverty will not necessarily insure peace and security. At the present time a bold program of technical assistance and economic aid to Asia would go a long way toward making Soviet Communism less attractive, but erasing poverty will not erase the basic cause of war. In our modern world wars are caused by the governments of powerful nations able and willing to enforce their will on peoples beyond their borders. This will to power is not curbed by developing the underdeveloped areas. But as Christians we must support vigorously every honest effort to fight poverty, disease, and ignorance, even if such efforts do not insure peace. Now let us turn to the central and more difficult task of the U.N.—the political task of keeping the peace.

Keeping the Peace

The U.N.'s proud record in the long-term task of weaving the fabric of peace and community has not been matched by equal success in the immediate task of keeping the peace. This is not the fault of the international organization any more than a breakdown in a labor-management dispute is the fault of the mediation process. The fault lies with the conflicting parties in both cases.

The U.N. cannot end the cold war, or break the disarmament deadlock, or prevent World War III. Decisions on these fateful issues must be made by those

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

who have the power to make them. And this power resides in Washington, Moscow, and other world capitals. While the U.N. does not have the power to solve international problems, it can and does provide an atmosphere conducive to conciliation and means for dealing with conflicts. The U.N. provides the channels and instruments of settlement, but in the final analysis a conflict will be solved *only* if the powers involved are willing to make the necessary compromises for solving it.

Since the end of World War II the most significant decisions in the political-security field have been made outside the U.N. The Soviet Union has developed her security arrangements with her European satellites and China. The West has established NATO and the Western European Union treaties for rearming West Germany. This is inevitable as long as the world is divided between two rival power blocs.

Does this mean that the Security Council and the General Assembly are completely powerless to keep the peace? No, but it does mean that where conflicting vital interests of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are at stake little can be done. In lesser disputes the U.N. has on several occasions provided both the atmosphere and the channels for reaching a settlement. (Korea is a major exception which we shall discuss later.)

In Greece U.N. "watchdog" commissions helped focus Soviet-satellite aid to Communist guerrillas. This moral pressure helped end the fighting there.

In the clash between India and Pakistan over the disputed state of Kashmir, a U.N. commission brought about a cease-fire agreement and is continuing negotiations for settling that conflict. Frank P. Graham, former

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

president of the University of North Carolina, is the U.N.'s representative for dealing with this problem.

Serious fighting between Israel and the Arab states was stopped, and further outbreak of hostilities prevented by an uneasy agreement negotiated at the U.N.

Twice, fighting between Dutch and Indonesians was stopped by the U.N., and with its help the Republic of Indonesia was born.

These four examples are sometimes referred to as the "four wars stopped by the U.N." That is a bit of an exaggeration, but it does point to the important role played by the organization. In every case the settlement achieved was made by the conflicting parties, but that settlement was facilitated by the moral pressure focused at the U.N. and by the agencies of mediation and negotiation provided by the U.N. For example, the "moral pressure" of the U.N. on the Dutch to grant Indonesia her independence was effective only because the Dutch had a moral conscience. The moral pressure of the U.N. against South Africa's race policy hardened rather than melted Prime Minister Malan's heart. Again, in the final analysis the failure or success of any effort to solve a problem rests with the sovereign states involved. But the international atmosphere of the U.N. does make a contribution to the settlement of issues if the disputing parties are so disposed.

Arrangements for the settlement of the Soviet blockade of Berlin are said to have been made informally by representatives of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in the corridors of the U.N. headquarters. But it can also be said with confidence that there would have been no satisfactory settlement from the West's point of view if the American-British airlift had not succeeded.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

This chapter is being written a few days after Secretary General Hammarskjöld returned from Peiping to negotiate in behalf of the U.N. for the release of eleven U.S. fliers and other U.N. prisoners detained in Red China. Although it is too early to predict how successful his effort will prove to be, his mission does illustrate how the U.N. can contribute to the solution of problems causing tension, even between the two major power blocs.

Korea and Collective Security

The free world's response to aggression in Korea in 1950 is an eloquent illustration of what the U.N. can and cannot do in the security field. Here was a clear case where conflicting "vital interests" of both the Soviet world and the West were at stake. What could the U.N. do? It is one of the curious ironies of history that the Soviet representatives of the Security Council were not present when the council decided, on June 25, 1950, that the North Korean military action was "a breach of the peace" and called for a cease-fire. The Security Council two days later recommended that all member nations assist in repelling the attack. Later 53 member nations endorsed this recommendation, although only 16 nations contributed directly to military action. Eight additional nations assisted in operations, and two had their offers deferred. Thirty-three member and non-member states offered emergency relief for Korea.

We all know the story. The aggressors (North Korea, Red China, and the Soviet Union) were repelled by collective U.N. action. It was a heavy price, and blunders were made, but the integrity of the Republic of Korea

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

was restored. The U.N. is still supervising the truce. Although the U.N. response in Korea would not have been possible without the decisive prior action of the United States that response has turned out to be the first example in history of collective military action to keep the peace.

In the Korean action the U.N. was effective in helping settle a conflict between the two big power blocs, but at the same time it was utterly powerless to compel compliance on the part of one of its own members, the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union completely disregarded the recommendations of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Let me emphasize again, the fault lies not with the structure of the U.N. or the Charter, but with the member states who fail to comply with their pledges under the Charter or with decisions of the Security Council or General Assembly. And the U.N. will never be able to compel compliance as long as it lacks the power to enforce majority decisions upon the offending nations or nation.

World government advocates want the U.N. transformed into a superstate with precisely such power. Most historians and political scientists say that such a radical modification of the modern nation state system is completely beyond the realm of possibility in the foreseeable future. And many social philosophers raise the question of the desirability of world government even if it were possible.

The U.S. Needs the U.N., and the U.N. Needs the U.S.

Most persons who believe in international cooperation are willing to accept the U.N. as a limited but valuable instrument for international cooperation among

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

sovereign states. What is needed to improve the international situation is not a new U.N. Charter or new U.N. agencies, but a willingness of nations to define their national interest in terms broad enough to take into account the needs, rights, and interests of other nations and peoples.

As long as the U.N. cannot provide sufficient security safeguards it is necessary for nations to develop collective security arrangements outside the U.N., but in harmony with the aims of its Charter. Most observers believe that the existence of NATO and the organization of American States has proved to be a deterrent to Soviet ambitions in Western Europe and Latin America. Security pacts in the Pacific have a similar goal.

The United States needs the U.N., not because we are weak, but because we are strong. We need the U.N. not only as a vehicle of cooperation, but also as an instrument of restraint on our national action. Genuine cooperation with other nations in the U.N. will help us see ourselves as others see us and translate our great power into morally responsible behavior. We need the constant criticism and judgment of other nations.

Likewise the United Nations needs the United States. If our country withdrew the organization would fold up. As Christians we must support intelligent and genuine participation of our country in all valid instruments of international cooperation. We need other nations as much as they need us.

And if we are tempted to become discouraged by seemingly endless talk at the U.N. headquarters, it is well to recall the words of Warren Austin, former chief U. S. delegate to the U.N.: "It is better for aged diplomats to get ulcers than for young men to get shot."

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

Questions to Be Considered
While Reading

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

1. What one thing limits the role of the United Nations in the quest for peace?
2. What two roles must the U.N. play if we are to have peace?
3. How does the Trusteeship Council fit into the structure of peace?
4. Do you agree with the author that the elimination of poverty will not insure peace?
5. If the United Nations cannot end the cold war or indubitably prevent a hot one, what is its role in the immediate task of keeping peace?
6. What is necessary if "moral pressure" is to be successful as a tool of peace?
7. In the case of the Korean conflict the Soviet Union ignored the recommendations of the United Nations. Could that have been avoided if the structure of the United Nations had been different?
8. Do you feel that collective security (such as NATO) outside the United Nations, but in harmony with its charter, can be effective in keeping peace?
9. When should such arrangements be discontinued?
10. Is a strong country, like the United States, dependent on the United Nations in the quest for peace?

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCHES AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

BY ELFAN REES

What have the churches to do with international affairs? is a question that is rarely posed nowadays. We live in a day and situation in which ivory towers are most unprofitable habitations and we do not ask coward's questions. We know that the churches have a responsibility *for* international affairs and *in* international affairs. The impact of international disorder on men and nations brings it inescapably under the judgment of Christ and there must be Christian opinion and moral judgments on the patterns of world behaviour. The International Missionary Council was able to note in 1952, "A growing recognition of Christian responsibility to promote world peace and international justice, both in obedience to God's will for all men and as freeing the proclamation of the Gospel from grievous hindrances."

We recognize our responsibility and that is the beginning of wisdom. Our continuing dilemma is that we do not always know what the responsibility is nor how it is to be fulfilled. We recognize that moral judgments are valueless *in vacuo* and that they must be not only implicit in Christian faith but also explicit in Christian action. To discern the will of God in the ordering of men and nations is an ever-present task of the churches. At the same time, however, "persuasion" is of the essence of Christian discipleship and to know the will of God is

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

of little value unless those "in the know" can proclaim it and persuade others to acquiesce in it.

It would seem clear, therefore, that the responsibility of the churches in international affairs, certainly in the postwar years, has been the twofold one of discerning and proclaiming.

The Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches was a notable stocktaking in many fields. Not the least of the issues to come under review was the measure of the churches' response to the challenge of international affairs. In separate groups, Committee VII and Section IV, the Assembly sought both to evaluate the action of the churches and to deepen their discernment of God's will as the basis of action.

In the field of action it seemed that in the last ten years the churches have accepted responsibility in international affairs more seriously and more actively than at any previous time in Protestant history. If this be so it must surely be due in large measure to the concurrent development of the ecumenical movement. The establishment, by the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council jointly, of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs provided a point of focus for discernment and a point of departure for action which our churches had never previously had. It follows naturally that the activity of the Commission has become the main, though not the only, touchstone of Christian responsibility in international affairs.

The main pragmatic issues which the churches, and on their behalf the Commission, face in this field are:

1. What areas or aspects of international affairs can the churches speak on with wisdom and authority?

THE CHURCHES AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

2. What is Christian judgment thereon?
3. How can that judgment best be brought to bear?

There is no single or simple answer to any one of these problems. The Commission has had to feel its way carefully in the light of events, hopes and fears, and the reaction of the churches to them.

On the question of what to be concerned with a pattern has evolved, by empirical process, which is beginning to be comprehensive though not by any means all inclusive. The world order issues with which the Commission has been primarily concerned since its establishment are:

- (i) The dangers to peace and justice from Soviet-Western conflict and the resulting armaments race
- (ii) Violations of human rights
- (iii) The growing demand for economic, social and political justice in underdeveloped and dependent areas
- (iv) The problem of refugees

In United Nations parlance the Commission has been concerned with the Prevention of War, Disarmament, Human Rights, Dependent Peoples, Technical Assistance, Refugees and Migration. There was little or no tendency at Evanston to criticize the inclusion of any one of these issues within the churches' concern nor to seek additions to the list. They may not by any means exhaust the areas of the churches' concern, but they are the crucial issues of the times and they certainly are, in their range and complexity, a full tax on the skill and manpower which the churches can make available.

The fundamental problem of discerning Christian judgment on these issues was the main preoccupation of

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

Section IV at Evanston. It can more conveniently be discussed later in this article. Meanwhile, some reconsideration was necessarily given to the application of judgments or the techniques of persuasion.

The five basic assumptions on which the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs carries forward its work are:

1. The Gospel has meaning for relations between peoples and nations but without technical skills this meaning cannot be applied. The effort to prevent war, for example, is a technical problem and it is not enough merely to say "we want peace."
2. Periodic conferences have value in seeking to discern God's will and shaping policy but an effective programme must operate on a day-to-day basis. The issues of war and peace do not accommodate themselves to the calendar of church conferences.
3. Resolutions and statements by churches have political effect only when they are directed to the time and place where international decisions are made.
4. For an effective testimony to the world of nations the churches need a specialized organization supported by an educated constituency with an enlightened conscience.
5. The churches, as they offer their testimony, must avoid any political entanglements which would compromise the independence of the churches' witness.

These assumptions, tentative when the Commission was established in 1948, have been proved sound by the experience of the years and have become the policy framework of ecumenical action in international affairs. The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs has become a "specialized organization." It does seek to apply the meaning of the Gospel with technical

THE CHURCHES AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

skill and on a day-to-day basis. By its consultative relationship with the United Nations it is at the time and place where international decisions are made.

The details of what the Commission has sought to do and achieve do not belong in this article. They are to be found in its reports and the churches are the best judges. It is noteworthy, as some examples of its being "at the right place at the right time," that it has been represented at every General Assembly of the United Nations, at every session of the Human Rights Commission and at every debate on refugees. Nor does it assume that the struggle for peace with justice is confined to the councils of the United Nations. At the Korea Truce Conference, the Berlin Foreign Ministers' Conference and the Geneva Asiatic Conference, representatives of the Commission used whatever opportunities presented themselves for witness and persuasion.

It would seem then that two of the pragmatic questions have been answered, if only for the time being. The tribulations of our time and the reaction of the churches have combined to define the areas for current Christian concern in international affairs. The establishment of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs has provided the machinery for persuasion and day-to-day witness. There remains the overriding problem of discernment. The ultimate issue is to know what God would have us do and say. There can be no binding series of resolutions on revelation nor is this a mechanical process which can be left to an organization. Discernment, in this sense, is a task which calls for the prayer and thought, the dialogue and debate of the whole Church. The Commission and its executive Committee, and also the National Commissions singly and in international

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

dialogue, are constantly seeking the right word. Resolutions and statements from ecumenical and denominational conferences are of great importance. At all times, however, there has to be vigilance to ascertain that we speak with the voice of God and not with the voice of men.

Evanston may well prove to be a landmark in this task of discernment. The Second Assembly was one of those rare occasions when men from many churches in many nations and in different political situations waited humbly upon the Lord and were unanimous in their conviction that, in so far as it is in man to do so, they had discerned God's will for Christian international action in our troubled times.

Section IV met at Evanston overwhelmed by its responsibility and awed into humility by its sense that millions were looking to it for some word of hope when hope in mundane organizations was fading. It described itself as a group "ready to face situations that seem hopeless and yet to act in them as men whose hope is indestructible." The report of the section "Christians in the Struggle for World Community" was unanimously commended to the study of the churches and is available. It need not be recapitulated in detail here. While it is as much concerned with the means to world order as it is with peace as its end, it deals with broad principles and leaves the detailed work of application to the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. Not the least significant of the debates in the Section were those that dealt with semantics. It seemed as though men were determined not only to define Christian attitudes to world problems but to clothe these definitions in Christian terminology rather than use too slavishly the current political vocabulary. The substitution of the sub-title

THE CHURCHES AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

"Living Together in a Divided World" for the draft "The Need for Co-existence" is one example of this. Convinced that it is God's will for men that they should live together, even in division, the Section was nevertheless unwilling to state this in terms which might suggest divine sanction for an unhappy political adventure in Manchuria and a political catch phrase from the Kremlin.

In a similar way the sub-title "What Nations Owe to One Another" was designed to eliminate from Christian thinking all concepts of paternalism and "mission bungalow" attitudes in relations between economically developed and underdeveloped nations.

All this was not fussiness in the use of words but real finesse in seeking a Christian definition of what was believed to be Christian judgment on the patterns and policies of world order.

The report was commended to the churches for study and the ultimate purpose of this article is to suggest where such study might begin and to urge the importance of beginning it now.

Some sections of the report, such as "The Protection of Human Rights" and "The United Nations and World Community" will probably evoke less discussion and study than others. Not because they are not discussable but because there is already so much unanimity and certainty about them amongst Christians. The areas of puzzlement and, perhaps, controversy are those of "War and Peace and Living Together," while the issue of "What Nations Owe to One Another" involves questions of attitude and action which we have not yet resolved amongst ourselves. It is to be regretted that the Section talked of "The Desire for Peace and the *Fear* of War" rather than the Abhorrence of War. Fear has no place

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

in the armour of God and it was not out of any other fear than the fear of the Lord that the Section spoke. Nevertheless major attention must be directed to this part of the Report, and the consequential issue of living together. It was quite clear to the Section that the alternatives before our generation were, to fall back on political language, co-destruction or co-existence. Christians will be steadfast in affirming the conflict of conviction about the origin and destiny of man between Christianity and atheistic materialism. In so doing, however, Christians must consider whether this conflict constitutes an insuperable bar to living together in a world so divided.

To what extent, in the modern world, is it a Christian duty to tolerate what we know to be evil rather than to challenge its professors to war?

What minimum requirements must Christians insist upon before they can co-operate in even frail sub-Christian expedients for creating international order?

"The first move into an order of genuine co-operation," says the Report, "must surely be in the direction of peaceful competition with genuine co-operation." By what means should the proponents of the reconciliation of the nations respond, so long as the world remains sharply divided, to the challenge of competition in such areas as the propagation of faith, the needs of under-developed countries, disarmament and the protection of human rights?

Students of the Report cannot evade these questions. Evanston has put forward proposals for limited progress in world order whose implications may well shock the theological and political preconceptions of many Christians. It is essential that these implications shall be under-

THE CHURCHES AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

stood and accepted for what they are or else be validly refuted.

On the question of "What Nations Owe to One Another," the Section emphasises that "relations between people hitherto 'subject' and 'ruling' should be one of partnership and co-operation."

Dorothy Fosdick in her new book writes, "Many Americans think foreign policy is a way of extending to those less well-off than themselves some of the benefits and advantages of life," and later quotes George F. Kinnan, "... even benevolence, when addressed to a foreign people, represents a form of intervention into their internal affairs."

This problem, while primarily one for America, is not exclusively so. The whole issue of the motive and method of the free interchange of economic and technical aid, and, as well, of ideas and cultures is a modern day challenge. It may be "more blessed to give than to receive" but it is certainly more difficult. Many will disagree with Miss Fosdick's suggestion that an element of self-concern is necessary to make this operation acceptable, "... a pious claim that aid is simply a 'work of love' only confirms their fears."

Christians must learn to study this as a two-way activity of giving and receiving and must somehow think themselves through into a situation which ensures that the motive for which and the manner in which the world's wealth is more equitably shared reveal neither economic opportunism nor political pragmatism, but simply the moral imperative of our spiritual heritage.

The Section finally called attention to the need for an international moral standard. Attempts to find some less classical definition of the rules of the game for living

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

together failed and the Report reads, "Underlying the more obvious barriers to a genuine world community is the lack of a common foundation of moral principles—This world of nations desperately needs an international ethos to provide a sound groundwork for the development of international law and institution." The Report tentatively advances nine essential principles of an international ethos. Particular emphasis was laid on their tentative character and on the need for sustained study of the issue. Are the principles all valid? Should there be others? Do we ask too much or too little in the way of fundamental rules for living together?

Here are some of the problems that follow from Evanston's search after God's will. It is only as they are answered that the full impact of Evanston can be felt and even then only when they are answered by all the churches.

A great weakness of the strength of the ecumenical movement is that so much of its activity originates at the top. In the field of international affairs the C.C.I.A. is the spearhead. Fortunately it is not the only point of departure. With growing strength and certainty National Commissions and Departments of International Affairs of National Councils of Churches are playing their role in all three tasks of defining concerns, discerning judgments and actions vis-à-vis their own governments. Denominational action is, so far, patchy and irresolute. The Crusade for World Order of The Methodist Church is a notable exception to, rather than a good example of, what is happening. Activity and concern in individual churches and congregations seems to come last of all. The C.C.I.A. has emphasized its need to be supported by an educated constituency with

THE CHURCHES AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

an enlightened conscience. It is the churches and not the United Nations which constitute that constituency. The Evanston Report on "Christians in the Struggle for World Community" has already made an impact in United Nations circles but the force of that impact will wane unless it can gain strength from the thoughtful and vigorous support of the churches.

Present areas of concern are defined for us. The machinery exists to bring Christian judgment to bear on them at the right time and place. The question that must be answered every day is What is Christian judgment? The answer must come not from a chosen few but from the churches everywhere. The members of Section IV were not unanimous on the great issues before them when they commenced their task at Evanston. By the grace of God they achieved unanimity as they worked together. There must be many conflicting views in the churches on the issues which the Report raises. The same kind of dialogue is needed in the churches. God's grace will not be wanting and by it there can emerge so great a consensus of Christian judgment as to endow the representation of it with a power not our own.

At Evanston a task was begun which must be completed and can be completed only in the churches.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

Questions to Be Considered
While Reading

THE CHURCHES AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

1. What are the origin and purpose of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.
2. What are the four world issues which this Commission faces on behalf of the churches?
3. Why are technical skill and an educated constituency important factors in persuasion?
4. Compare the effectiveness of:
 - a. Periodic Conferences
 - b. A program operated on a day-to-day basis
 - c. Resolutions by churches
5. What are the essentials in the task of discernment?
6. Why is "political vocabulary" so carefully avoided in the report of the Section of the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches on "Christians in the struggle for World Community?"
7. "What minimum requirements must Christians insist upon before they can co-operate in even frail sub-Christian expedients for creating international order?" (Quoted directly from article.)
8. What does Dr. Rees mean by "the need for an international moral standard?" What part do the churches play in fulfilling this need?

CHAPTER V

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

By MARGARET BENDER

The meeting places of the World Council of Churches and of the United Nations seem a long way from the pews of our local churches. Often they are far away in a manner that no geographical place is separated from another in this day of marvels of rapid transportation. Sometimes as we look at the life within those churches we realize that it moves in its old familiar ruts quite as if the events of the last decade—the first and second meeting of the World Council of Churches, the formation of the United Nations, the dropping of the atomic bomb, and the first groping efforts to halt its destructive course and turn it toward man's good—had never happened. Here and there churches have been stimulated by the challenges and problems of the times and have found new vitality. In this new vitality lies the greatest hope for a durable world peace. The will to bring it about must be with "we, the people" of the local churches.

Our eyes and ears have grown dulled. We have heard and seen so many noisy and astounding things that we are insensitive to real values. We are so much occupied with the tremendous complications of our daily lives that we cannot spare enough interest for the portentous things that are happening around us. We are so surfeited with the elaborate details of the petty events with which our newspapers bombard us that we have no time to see things in a proper historical perspective. The church is probably the only institution with the resources

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

and the courage to attempt to change this picture. The mandates to do so are certainly not lacking. "The Methodist Church," says its *Discipline*, "aims to view the perplexing times and problems which we face today in the light of the teachings of Jesus." The World Council meeting in Evanston said: "Because Jesus Christ is Lord in earth and heaven, the call to responsible social action which God addresses to his church does not present us with an impossible task. We are not called upon to shoulder the burden of this world, but to seek justice, freedom and peace to the best of our ability in the social order. The church knows that in obedience and prayer our efforts will bear fruit. For God has called us unto liberty to serve one another by love. 'Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it.'"

All that is lacking is an insistent belief among us, as we gather together in our several churches, that the task is both imperative and possible. The World Council Report says: "In all these fields (the responsible society looking on world problems) the real dangers are complacency, lack of imagination, and the dull sense of hopelessness that settles upon those of little faith." Each one of these dangers is also a stumbling stone in our local churches. Is it possible for the average church to set up a program in which the individual will become so involved in seeking a Christ-dictated solution to the problems that stand between us and peace that he will lose his complacency and hopelessness and feel his imagination quickened? In the answer that we find for this question may lie more significance than we can even understand at the moment. Certainly it will be worth while to look at our resources and see what hope they offer us.

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

The local church looks to Evanston for insight

In the first chapter of this book Georgia Harkness suggests that there are three concentric circles of cooperation through which work for peace can be channeled. The first of these she describes as Christians learning to work with other Christians from common Christian principles. Obviously the first step for most of us is to become clear about the matters on which we have common Christian judgments. Here the resource of the Evanston report will be a wonderful starting point. It has set us a task worthy of our position as sons of God. Writing of it Harold Bosley says: "If I might put it in one potent package: We as a church and as churchmen are asked to take the lead in building a responsible society all over the world. We are asked to begin wherever we are, with the problems at hand, and to keep at them until in the providence of God his will is done on earth as it is in heaven." A study guide for it (Every Church and Evanston) has been prepared and will make it easy to conduct a study course.

The six topics with which the report deals are: I. Our Oneness in Christ and Our Disunity As Churches; II. The Mission of the Church to Those Outside Her Life; III. The Responsible Society in a World Perspective; IV. Christians in the Struggle for World Community; V. The Church Amid Racial and Ethnic Tensions, and VI. The Christian and His Vocation. Some of the questions which are raised are bound to awaken interest.

Probably one of the most important of these is the discussion of a need for an international moral standard or "ethos." The report says: "Underlying the more obvious barriers to a genuine world community is the

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

lack of a common foundation of moral principles. At the root of the most stubborn conflicts is the failure of governments and peoples to treasure any common set of guiding principles— The world of nations desperately needs an international ethos to provide a sound groundwork for the development of international law and institutions. This requires not only attempts to find wider areas of common moral understanding, but also efforts to bring the guiding principles of international life into greater harmony with God's will. Christians should urge statesmen to devote more attention to this fundamental task. In order to do this with authority Christians must be clear on their own understanding of the essential principles."

The report then advances a tentative list of nine principles that might be used. A study and discussion of these is probably one of the greatest obligations and opportunities that lies before the Christian who longs to do something toward advancing the cause of peace.

1. All power carries responsibility and all nations are trustees of power which should be used for the common good.
2. All nations are subject to moral law, and should strive to abide by the accepted principles of international law to develop this law and to enforce it through common actions.
3. All nations should honor their pledged word and international agreements into which they have entered.
4. No nation in an international dispute has the right to be sole judge in its own cause or to resort to war to advance its policies, but should seek to settle disputes by direct negotiations or by submitting them to conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement.

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

5. All nations have a moral obligation to ensure universal security and to this end should support measures designed to deny victory to a declared aggressor.
6. All nations should recognize and safeguard the inherent dignity, worth, and essential rights of the human person, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.
7. Each nation should recognize the rights of every other nation, which observes such standards, to live by and proclaim its own political and social beliefs, provided that it does not seek by coercion, threat, infiltration or deception to impose these on other nations.
8. All nations should recognize an obligation to share their scientific and technical skills with peoples in less developed regions, and to help the victims of disaster in other lands.
9. All nations should strive to develop cordial relations with their neighbors, encourage friendly cultural and commercial dealings, and join in creative international efforts for human welfare.

Local churches seeing that peace is made by setting our houses in order

One of the most important tasks of the local church is bringing a clear picture of the places where we can begin to create the foundations for a lasting peace. The interest of the church in the security of our family life, the ease with which those of different races and nationalities move within our fellowship, the conditions of mutual co-operation under which both labor and management can secure the greatest gains, is something that needs to be established in the minds of most people, both because we have not been in the habit of consider-

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

ing its relationship to every area of human life and because we have not thought through thoroughly enough the relationship of these things to a peaceful world. The Evanston report furnishes us with a good place to begin as we approach the significance of the family in efforts to secure a peaceful world. "Human living," says the report, "acquires meaning and depth only in relations with other persons, and since an individual can have direct and close contact only with a limited number of people the art of social living has to be learned in small groups.

"The most fundamental of these is the family. For this reason the churches must give strong warning against the widespread disruption of family life. The family itself needs to be protected; for this the witness of the Christian family is all-important. More attention should be given to the conditions which cause the forcible separation of families and every effort should be made to reunite those who have been separated. For right development into responsible adulthood, children need security and love, and the discipline which family life preeminently secures. Disintegration here is closely related to disintegration in the larger groupings of society. In predominantly non-Christian countries, the building of a Christian family life implies in some cases a rupture with old non-Christian family systems. The specifically Christian attitude toward the family should be clarified within different cultural circumstances in order to strengthen the community life of Christians in its most elemental form."

One important area of concern for the family can be approached through the study of family security in the economic field where such problems as unemploy-

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

ment, old age, sickness, temporary or permanent disability or death of the breadwinner raise problems that must be considered and dealt with both locally and nationally. Another area of concern is that of the emotional and psychic health of the family where we must deal with factors of education, of the achievement of brotherhood through better community living, of the church as an active agent in giving the family the undergirding resources and services which will enable it to achieve this type of security. A third area in which concern for the family needs to be manifested is that of immigration where present laws in the United States and basic political disturbances elsewhere either separate families or make their reuniting difficult. The Evanston report offers suggestions of responsibility that touch these problems when it says that the churches have a duty to promote "adequate assistance on the national and international level for children, the sick, the old, the refugees, and other economically weak groups by means of church organizations, voluntary societies, and local and national governments."

It is perhaps a little unjust that our faults in America today should receive so much publicity but in a divided, apprehensive, straw-clutching world that is bound to be true. The Christian must ponder long the dangers that may lie in even what may seem a justified desire to move slowly in matters of establishing equal opportunity for everyone, both in the realm of personal dignity and of material well being. He must decide where his own responsibility lies in areas which he has never thought to face. "Actually," Dr. Bosley says in commenting on the World Council statement, "if we want to go to the root of this matter of racial injustice, we will find it in

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

our own sinfulness. And if we want to bear the Christian witness against the evil, we begin not by an assault upon someone else but by an act of profound soul searching within ourselves." Few individuals and few communities would not benefit themselves and the prospects for a united trusting world by such self-examination. "All churches and all Christians are involved, whether they recognize it or not, in the racial and ethnic tensions of the world, says the World Council."

Imagination is perhaps the most vital characteristic of the Christian on a quest for a way to make the fellowship of his own church a potential for peace. It takes imagination to see a case of discrimination on the ground of race in the United States as affecting elections in India or Africa. It takes imagination to see the effect of a high import tariff on the achievement of settled conditions in some country that needs to sell us goods in order to be able to buy from us the materials necessary for developing a better standard of living. It takes imagination to see the headlines of the newspaper and the daily contacts of community life in terms of their importance to world peace.

Local churches learning to understand the wealth that lies in diversity

One of the many contradictions of our times is the delight with which we seize upon the diverse and the new in the gadgets and appurtenances of daily living and the reluctance with which we accept the fact that there are many people in the world who aren't like us in speech or color or habit of thought, dress and conduct. It is most intriguing to have a refrigerator of design and color that is quite different from anything that we

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

ever saw before, but to have a next-door neighbor with an equally different appearance and behavior is often a matter of reluctance. Because of this attitude, hurts which are often unintentional are inflicted. The word foreign may come to have an unpleasant connotation. The classic example of the number of New York taxi drivers who would explain their distrust of the UN by saying that it is "a bunch of foreigners" finds parallels in the tone of our present immigration law and in the attitude of the community that fails to make the new-comer welcome. "Getting to know you—getting to like you" are the words of a song that might well be implemented by the local church. There are two ways in which this can be achieved—by study and by personal contact. The opportunities for study that are open to a church are almost unlimited. Missionary texts and missionary periodicals bring a wealth of material. The only obstacle may be the attitude with which the study is undertaken. If the approach is made in a spirit of tremendous interest in those who are our fellow stockholders in a corporation for peace, the effect will be good. If, however, we come to it as the slightly condescending group that has all the answers to all the problems and all the right ways of doing things, the results may move us farther than ever from understanding. In the latter case we may learn only to see the people we study as interesting curiosities. A study of the differences in customs and manners between another group and our own will be of value only if the reasons behind them are stressed. It is more rewarding, however, to study the ways in which we are similar. An understanding of the fact that we are really one in the big things and separated to a large extent by the

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

superficial ways in which we express the great desires and values of our lives is even more important.

The world of today with its increasing exchange of persons for business and pleasure offers opportunities to approach the understanding of other cultures and civilizations by direct contact as well as by study. The possibilities are endless once we begin to look around. Many communities have people who are here to learn new processes or to introduce new processes in industrial plants. Larger communities may have foreign consulates. Most American colleges now have some foreign students. Many communities are near enough to the United Nations so that invitations to its personnel are a possibility. Within the fellowship of the church there are missionaries and nationals available.

Here again it is the approach that is important. If people are received as people that we need to know and who need to know us, the experience can be rich and revealing. If they are regarded as something strange to be exhibited and marveled at, we will find ourselves accentuating the differences between us without understanding the reason for them or the ways in which we think and feel alike. In this case the best values that could come out of such an experience will have been lost.

The local church learning to look with the long eye of history

"Back to the history books" may sound like a depressing assignment to many of us, but there can be no doubt that it is part of the job that has to be done if we are to work for peace with any hope of success.

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

Fortunately, the assignment is one that improves as we begin to understand the necessity for it. Never before in the history of the world have different centuries met so frequently and at such close quarters as they do today. Those who signed the Charter of the United Nations in 1945 counted among the peoples that they represented the state of development characteristic of almost any century that you could name, and some of them could have pointed to the problems of peoples that had not come as far as the periods represented by written history. There were words in the Charter that represented concepts so new to some of the people in whose behalf it was signed that it was necessary to introduce new words into the language. There are places where technical assistance is engaged in spanning three centuries in three years as it brings twentieth century living standards to people whose experience predates the industrial revolution.

In a world as complicated as this it becomes necessary to understand the point at history at which various peoples find themselves as this is an extremely important factor in their attitudes and reactions. To cite one example, the world is full of instances of new nationalism exhibited by peoples newly free and obsessed with the significance of that freedom. If we do not understand this basic fact we may unnecessarily touch upon sensitive spots or find negotiations too difficult. If we remember that the pride of the newly free is much the same whether exhibited by Norway in 1907, the United States in the first decades of the nineteenth century, or India in mid-twentieth century, we will have come a long way toward our part in world understanding.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

The local church learning to work in the second circle of cooperation

"The second concentric circle within which we must act," says Dr. Harkness, "is that of Christians working with other American citizens who are men of good will, believing in the democratic way of life and its requirements of liberty and justice for all."

This kind of cooperation is even harder than trying to discover the things on which Christians can work together for here we must not only know what is the essential part that must not be sacrificed for the advantage of working together, but we must also find the ways to smoothe the sometimes difficult paths of cooperation. However, the church is obviously the best agency to undertake the responsibility of seeing that that cooperation is established and continued. The message of love and reconciliation and patience that the church brings can make the task possible. The first step is to decide that the effort shall be as nearly universal as possible, with no groups left out of the initial planning, and to make a special effort to secure the cooperation of any who may have grown used to being left out of cooperative efforts. The second is to plan an appeal which will be challenging to as many people as possible without in any way predetermining the plans that the group will need to make together. A dramatic statement of need that ties the local situation to the world situation will probably have the best chance of making a successful appeal. Sometimes something that gives an opportunity for everyone to work together on a big task, such as a big community event designed to correct misunderstanding of the United Nations or a project

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

to establish adequate housing on an unrestricted basis, will establish better understanding.

The third step, that of getting the first planning meeting off to a good start is probably the hardest. Before going into such a meeting your church, if it has not already had experience in this particular field, may want to look at the following suggestions:

1. *Group Atmosphere.* We do not always realize what an important part atmosphere can play in the success of a meeting. If your community has never tried to work together as a whole, or if its past experiences in this field have not been wholly successful, you will want to explore all possibilities of making the group atmosphere as good as possible. The physical characteristics of the place where the meeting is to be held are some of the first factors to be considered. The place chosen should be a friendly one, one that none of the groups will feel hesitant about entering. It ought to be as comfortable as possible without, for example, the stiff seating arrangements of a school room or the usual discomfort and drabness of the municipal building. A crowded small room is better than a small group huddled in one corner of a huge room. The friendliness with which each arrival is greeted is also an important factor in creating the atmosphere.

2. *Tension Reduction.* As we begin an active program for world peace it will be well for us to stop to look at the tensions that exist in our own communities. Perhaps you are fortunate enough to work in a community where there is little surface tension. However, it is certain that there are fundamental differences in opinion and interests which, although they seldom come to the fore in an open conflict, do lower the ability of the

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

community to cooperate. Whether you face open resentments between groups, or whether you are working in a situation that seems very good on the surface, the same methods may be helpful. The first thing to do is to make sure that everyone feels that his contribution will be welcomed and considered important. Whether you are acting as temporary chairman or not, it is possible to do this by noting those who are slow to speak and saying in a friendly, relaxed tone, "I'd like to hear what Mr. ——— thinks. He has had experience with (picking up something that you know the individual has done in the community) and I'm sure his thinking would be helpful."

Another important thing is to try to find common agreement on some central areas before you approach the things on which you are bound to disagree. For instance, there will be many differences of opinion about what is the most constructive thing to do in the community, but there will be general agreement on the proposition that peace is something that we all desire. By skillfully working from the generally accepted to the less accepted, tensions can be relieved.

3. *Giving everyone a job.* A community effort will be successful in proportion to the degree that everyone in the group feels that he and his organization have a vital job to do. It is important that everyone's job should be one which he is fitted to do, and it should appeal to him as being something worth doing. This is particularly true in the case of groups that may be venturing into community cooperation for the first time. It will be equally unfortunate to put the leadership entirely in the hands of either the experienced people who are always at the head of any community endeavor, or

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

in the hands of new leadership. A balanced combination of the two will do much to insure success.

If out of all this planning and work toward cooperating with others of "good will" in your community comes only limited results in terms of action, you will still have made progress if you can feel that the community is better acquainted and more aware of the possibilities of working together. If out of all the efforts to create within your church and among its members a program of work for peace there have come only limited results you still have made progress if you can feel that there is a growing spirit of understanding of the way that all of our fates are bound inextricably together. "Does your church live for itself, or for the world around and beyond it?" asks the Message from Evanston. Even a slightly increased realization of this relationship in every church pew across our country would be a vast new potential for peace.

Questions to Be Considered While Reading

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE LOCAL CHURCHES

1. What is the most important contribution that your local church can make toward world peace?
2. Do you believe that your church can play a significant part in determining upon an international ethos?
3. How important to world peace is the picture that visitors from other countries form of the United States? What can your church do to help make that picture a constructive factor for world peace?

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

4. Are there aspects of United States behavior at the present time that need to be judged in the light of historical perspective?
5. How important do you think housing that perpetrates geographical segregation and segregated education and entertainment is in the struggle for world peace?
6. Several places in this book have references to the cynicism and feeling of frustration of the individual as great blocks in creating a peaceful world. Do you agree? If so, what do you consider the best way of overcoming this?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambassador's Report*, Chester Bowles. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. \$4.00.
- Common Sense and World Affairs*, Dorothy Fosdick. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1955. \$3.50.
- Cultures and Customs*, Eugene A. Nida. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. \$4.00.
- The Ecumenical Movement and the Racial Problems*, W. A. Visser 't Hooft. Published by UNESCO. Distributed by International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, New York, 1954. 40 cents.
- Evanston Speaks* (Report of The Second Assembly of The World Council of the Churches of Christ), New York: 1955. 50 cents. Order from: World Council of the Churches of Christ, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, New York.
- In the Cause of Peace*, Trygve Lie. (The history and work of United Nations as told by its first Secretary General.) New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954. \$6.00.
- Just Half a World Away—My Search for the New India*, Jean Lyon. New York: Crowell-Collier Publishing Co., 1954. \$5.00.
- Life Is Commitment*, J. H. Oldham. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. \$2.75.
- Plowshares and Pruning Hooks—A Symposium*. Introduction by Bishop Oxnam. Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, "The Meaning of Peace"; Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, "United Nations"; Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, "Universal Disarmament." Chicago: The Crusade for World Order, 1954. 50 cents. Order from: Central Promotional Office, 40 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Illinois.
- Rainbow Round the World*, Elizabeth Yates. (The story of UNICEF and the needs of children around the world.) New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1954. \$2.50.

TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS

Social Aspects of Technical Assistance. Published by UNESCO.

Distributed by International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, New York, 1954. 75 cents.

Windows for the Crown Prince, Elizabeth Gray Vining. New York: J. P. Lippincott, 1952. \$4.00.

PAMPHLETS AND LEAFLETS

Sixty-Five Years of Inter-American Cooperation. Free.

What the OAS Is Today. (Basic objectives of the Organization of American States, chart of the OAS: description of organs of the OAS, and examples of technical cooperation.) Free. Order from Division of Publication, Pan American Union, Washington 6, D. C.

MAGAZINES

The Annals, November, 1954. "The Future of United Nations; Issues of Charter Revision." The Academy of Political and Social Science, 3937 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. \$2.00.

World Outlook—1954-55.

The Methodist Woman—1954-55.

WHO'S WHO

Mrs. C. A. Bender is Associate Secretary in the Department of Christian Social Relations and Local Church Activities, Woman's Division of Christian Service, the Board of Missions of The Methodist Church.

Dr. Cameron B. Hall is executive director, Department of Church and Economic Life of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Dr. Georgia Harkness is Professor of Applied Theology, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California.

Mr. Ernest W. Lefever, formerly associate director of the Department of International Justice and Goodwill, National Council of Churches, is, as we go to press, taking a leave of absence while he prepares a doctor's thesis.

Dr. Elfan Rees is the representative in Europe of the Commission on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches.

WOMAN'S DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE
BOARD OF MISSIONS, THE METHODIST CHURCH
LITERATURE HEADQUARTERS
7820 READING ROAD, CINCINNATI 37, OHIO
PRICE, 65 CENTS

5/55

PB-04270
5-37
C